

REMARKS

In reply to the Office Action mailed June 18, 2007, please enter the amendments set forth above and consider the following remarks. By this response, Applicant amends claims 1, 6, 9-10, 13-15, 17-18 and 20, and cancels claim 12 without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. After entry of this paper, claims 1-11 and 13-20 will be pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner: (i) objected to the drawings; (ii) rejected claims 1-5 and 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,208,621 to Ducaroir *et al.* ("Ducaroir") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0140662A1 to Igarashi ("Igarashi"); (iii) rejected claims 7, 8, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ducaroir in view of Igarashi and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2001/0016929A1 to Bonneau *et al.* ("Bonneau"); and (iv) indicated that claims 6, 9, 17, and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully disagree, traversing the rejections and submitting that the amended claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth below. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Drawings

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the return telephone voicemail confirming that an exemplary test clock generator *is* shown in the drawings. (*See, for example*, callout 22 of Figures 7 and 8.) Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 10-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ducaroir in view of Igarashi. Claim 12 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus Applicant submits the rejection against this claim is moot.

Claims 7, 8, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ducaroir in view of Igarashi and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2001/0016929A1 to Bonneau *et al.* ("Bonneau")

Without acquiescence, in the interests of expediting prosecution and avoiding additional costs, Applicants have amended the independent claims under rejection, claims 1 and 10, to even further clarify the recited subject matter from the cited art. For example, amended claims 1 and 10 recite "a signal-receiving circuit connected to the reference clock generator, and configured to receive the serial data transmitted by the signal transmitter, and to generate a converted signal from the serial data in synchronization with the reference clock" and "a test circuit configured to detect a phase error between phase of the converted signal generated by the signal-receiving circuit and phase of the test clock, and to detect noise components included in the converted signal, when the signal transmitter operates in synchronization with the test clock."

With regard to the primary reference, Ducaroir fails to disclose at least these recitations. Instead, Ducaroir is directed to testing the ability of transceivers to transmit and receive data at specified *frequencies*, and, inter alia, contains no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding determination of phase information of converted signals/test clocks much less the detection of any phase error therebetween. Further, even if properly combinable, which Applicant does not concede, Igarashi, and particularly Figure 1 and paragraph 93 thereof, also fail to teach or suggest at least the phase error recitations of amended claims 1 and 10. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable over Ducaroir and Igarashi.

Furthermore, with regard to claims 7, 8, 18, and 19, Bonneau fails to disclose at least the recitations of their independent claims, claims 1 and 10, as quoted and discussed above. Here, again even if properly combinable with Ducaroir and Igarashi, which Applicant does not concede, the combination of reference with Bonneau fails to teach or suggest amended claims 1 and 10. For example, none of the serializing, deserializing, signal recovery and parallel data supply features of Bonneau cure the deficiencies in the base references, as addressed above. Therefore, amended independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable over Ducaroir, Igarashi and Bonneau for reasons consistent with these.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the cited references for at least the above reasons. With respect to claims 2-5, 7-8, 11, 13-16, and 18-19, these claims directly or indirectly depend upon claims 1 or 10, and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-16, and 18-19.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowability of claims 6, 9, 17, and 20. These claims have been rewritten in independent form, and Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6, 9, 17, and 20 are in condition for formal allowance.

Conclusory Remarks

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-11 and 13-20 are now in condition for allowance, and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number below if doing so will in any way facilitate prosecution of this application.


The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account **No. 07-1896** referencing Attorney Docket 352003-991350.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER US LLP

Dated: September 18, 2007

By



Andrew B. Schwaab
Reg. No. 38,611
Attorney for Applicant

DLA PIPER US LLP
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Attorney Direct (650) 833-2258